

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and arguments presented herein.

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 are amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Support for the amendments can be found at least on page 16 of the application.

§ 103 Rejections

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,937,743 (“Rassman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,208,765 (“Turnbull”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rassman nor Turnbull nor the combination thereof teaches or suggests “indicia coding selected components in the plurality of components to indicate a redundancy in the plurality of components, and indicia coding other selected components in the plurality of components to indicate an omission, the redundancy indicating a component provided by more than one vendor and the omission indicating a component not provided by a vendor” as recited in independent Claim 1, “a code segment that modifies the pictorial representation of the existing system to include indicia coding that associates the plurality of components with vendors that provide products and services associated with the plurality of components to provide a visual display of the products and services offered by each of the vendors, wherein the indicia coding is operable for indicating a redundancy in the plurality of components and is also operable for indicating an omission in the plurality of components, the redundancy indicating a component provided by more than one of the vendors and the omission

indicating a component not provided by any of the vendors” as recited in independent Claim 7 (emphasis added), “logic for indicia coding selected components in the plurality of components to indicate a redundancy in the plurality of components, and for indicia coding other selected components in the plurality of components to indicate an omission, the redundancy indicating a component provided by more than one vendor and the omission indicating a component not provided by a vendor” as recited in independent Claim 13, and/or “displaying indicia coding that associates components with vendors that provide products and services associated with the components to provide a visual display of the products and services offered by each of the vendors, wherein the indicia coding is operable for indicating a redundancy and also is operable for indicating an omission, the redundancy indicating a component provided by more than one of the vendors and the omission indicating a component not provided by any of the vendors” as recited in independent Claim 20 (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references are silent with regard to the specific features recited above. Page 8 of the Office Action, for example, acknowledges that Rassman does not disclose indicia coding that can indicate redundancy, and Applicants respectfully submit that Rassman also does not disclose indicia coding that can indicate an omission. Turnbull is relied upon to teach that which is admittedly not disclosed by Rassman. However, Applicants submit that Turnbull (even in combination with Rassman) does not teach indicia coding that can indicate a redundancy to indicate a component provided by more than one vendor or indicia coding that can indicate an omission to indicate a component not provided by a vendor, as claimed in independent Claims 1, 7, 13, and 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Rassman and Turnbull do not show or suggest the features of Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-26 in combination with the features of their respective base claim, and that Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-26 are in condition for allowance at least because they depend from an allowable claim.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-26 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusions

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO HAO & BARNES

Dated: March 14, 2011

/William A. Zarbis/

William A. Zarbis
Registration No. 46,120
Address: Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 938-9080 Ext. 113